DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

MB Docket No. 02-277; FCC **02-249**

RIN **4207**

In response to your notice 67 FR 65751:

I oppose loosening the rules designed to promote and protect diversity of media ownership. These rules were adopted to ensure that the public would receive a diverse range of viewpoints from the media, not simply the opinions of a handful of media conglomerates.

In the case of Associated Press v. United States No **57**, handed down on **18** June **1945**, the Supreme Court stated in part that the "freedom to publish means freedom for all, and not for some. Freedom to publish is guaranteed by the Constitution, but freedom to combine to keep others from publishing is not." The present situation with six or fewer corporations controlling nearly all of U.S. media, is a virtual monopoly which PREVENTS competition. This is a violation of the first amendment, and is not in the public interest. The public interest is served by a variety of "diverse and antagonistic sources" (Supreme Court same decision), not the present monolith of corporate opinion. Media ownership is too concentrated and should be diversified. Increased consolidation is neither in the public interest, nor allowed by the Constitution.

The present local radio ownership rule has led to the ownership of too many local radio stations in a given market by a single entity. While this may lead to diversity of format, it does not lead to diversity of information, news, or editorial content. The same argument applies to TV stations in the same market.

Cross-Ownership of broadcast media and print media in the same market destroys any pretext of diversity of opinion. In the case of a small market with three or fewer newspapers, and three or fewer television stations, this rule must be changed to prohibit any ownership of print media and broadcast media by the same party. The Constitution requires this .

William Lochstet
117 Ashtola Drive
Windber, PA, **15963**
lochstet+@pitt.edu

14 November 2002

original